

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VIII.

NEW YORK, APRIL, 1853.

NO. 4

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,

At No. 140 Fulton-street, (Up Stairs.)

TERMS.--Single copy, for one year, \$1; six copies, \$5; thirteen copies, \$10; always in advance.

HISTORICAL INQUIRY.

BY REV. J. FANTON HAM.

Continued from page 39.

FROM THE SECOND TO THE FIFTH CENTURY.

The controversy concerning human immortality, commenced so early as the latter part of the second century, and was, as might be supposed, considerably influenced by the philosophical notions of the time concerning the constitution of man. The anthropology, or doctrine of man, of the earlier theologians embraced a threefold division of the elements of his nature into body, soul, and spirit. The language of the Apostle Paul, in 2 Thess. v. 23, was accepted, not in its proper rhetorical, but in a strictly philosophical sense, and interpreted according to the philosophy of the times. Some adopted the dualistic theory, or twofold division of the nature of man into body and soul; the latter being regarded as a substance essentially distinct from the corporeal part or body. The question of human immortality thus from the first became mixed up with speculative ideas, and a phraseology, the off-spring of the primitive philosophy, was begotten, which has unfortunately survived to our own times and added much to the confusion and difficulty of the inquiry. It is of the first importance to apprise the student of this controversy that the inquiry took at the outset a particular form,—a strictly philosophical form. The question was rather metaphysical than religious, although it involved important religious consequences. The ancient anthropology lay at the basis of the theological inquiry concerning the immortality of man. Hence the peculiar phraseology of the primitive philosophical theology. The question was not concerning the immortality of *man* in his complete characteristic nature, but concerning the immortality of the *soul* as a supposed distinct and separable part of man, and the seat of the human personality. If immortality pertained to man's natural constitution it could only pertain to that part of him which was imagined to be independent of any material organization, and not liable to the laws of material existence. The soul was considered to be this part,—an immaterial substance, capable of existing in a state separate from the body. It is undeniable that this notion about the separate state of the soul, and its being the seat of personal consciousness, was an importation into Christianity of the old Greek philo-

sophy. The departed *souls* of the early Christianity were the *shades* of Homer and the Greeks.

We are anxious to guard our readers against the very natural mistake of identifying the ideas of the early speculative Christians with those of the sacred writers. The terminology of their philosophy, in regard to the terms soul, spirit, body, flesh, is the terminology of the Scriptures, and there is a danger of concluding that these terms, common to both, have a common value and signification. The locality or state of the dead, moreover, is called, both in Scripture and the Greek philosophy, *Hades*,* the unknown or unseen place or state, as this word etymologically means. But it may suffice to mention here, for the sake of showing the difference between the Hebrew theology and the Grecian philosophy, that while the Greeks peopled their Hades with disembodied spirits or souls in a state of consciousness and activity, the sacred writers describe their Hades as the resting place of the dead,—a condition of "darkness,"—a "land of forgetfulness,"—where thought and memory are extinguished, and silence alone prevails. "The dead know not anything." "In that very day their thoughts perish." "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence." Let our readers mark this important distinction, lest they be betrayed into the common popular error of supposing that the terms soul, body, &c., of Scripture have the same verbal value as these terms have in the speculative theology of the second century, and which, through the prevalence of the ancient philosophy during the successive periods of historic Christianity, has become the orthodox theology of our own times. Modern, as well as ancient Christianity, retains the faith of the old Pagan philosophy of the Greeks concerning the soul and its immortality, and regardless of the extraordinary consequences of imposing these Pagan ideas upon the sacred nomenclature of the Bible, persists in avowing the ancient

* The Hebrew word signifying the place or state of the dead is *sheol*, which the translators of the Septuagint, or Greek version of the Old Testament, rendered by the Greek word *hades*. The Greek language being that in which the New Testament was originally written, this word *hades* was also introduced in its Septuagint sense into the Christian Scriptures. The term *hades* in the sacred writings has a widely different signification from the same term as employed by the Greek philosophers and poets: it is the Greek New Testament equivalent of the Hebrew *sh ol*. Neither of these terms express a *real locality*,—they only express *our ignorance* of the condition, so to speak, into which the deceased have passed. When a person died, the Hebrews said he had descended into *sheol*, and the Greek Christians into *hades*; not meaning thereby that the person deceased had gone as a conscious being into some new place of abode, but that he had experienced that mysterious change, of which we are all necessarily *ignorant*. Both the words *sheol* and *hades* signify in their respective languages *that which is unseen or unknown*.

philosophical faith, and interpreting the Scriptures on its false principles.

The scriptural inquiry, as we have already remarked, concerns not the *soul* as a distinct substance and *part* of man, but *man* as a creature of God, "fearfully and wonderfully made." The former is strictly philosophical, the latter a religious inquiry. But the deductions of human philosophy have ever been intruded into this religious question, and have so effectually influenced the language of the controversy, that without carefully noting this fact confusion and dissatisfaction must necessarily ensue. At the very opening of the inquiry, in the discussions which took place in the second century, we observe a departure from the language of Scripture, and a phraseology employed coincident with the ancient philosophy. The inquiry improperly relates to the *soul*, instead of the *whole man*, of how many soever parts he may be compounded. But notwithstanding this circumstance, there were those who, inclining no doubt to the Scripture revelation,—that immortality is a *gift* or Christian *reward*, and not a personal or inherent possession,—denied the immortality of the abstract soul, and maintained that it perished in death with the body.

Among these Justin Martyr must unquestionably be numbered. In his Dialogue with Trypho there occurs a passage which, whatever he may have meant by it, certainly involves the conclusion that the soul is not in itself, by constitution, immortal. "I indeed say not that all souls die," certainly implies that *some* souls die, and if some die, then there is nothing in the soul's constitution essentially independent of destruction. "At the time of judgment," he again says, "those souls that appear worthy of God *die no more*; but the rest shall be punished as long as God shall be pleased to *continue their existence*, and their punishment." Tatian is more explicit. "The soul in itself," he says, "is not immortal, but mortal; nevertheless it has the power of escaping mortality." Theophilus of Antioch raises the following question, "Was Adam created with a mortal or immortal nature?" and replies, "neither the one nor the other, but he was fitted for both, in order that he might receive immortality as a reward." The historian of doctrines, Professor Hagenbach, remarks on the state of the controversy at this period, that it had "more of a philosophical than Christian bearing. . . . The Christian doctrine of immortality," he says, "cannot be considered apart from the person, work, and kingdom of Christ, and must rest upon Christian perceptions and promises."

The testimony of Irenæus, the contemporary of Justin Martyr, is equally emphatic. He argued that whatever had a birth or beginning must be mortal and corruptible. "Life," he writes, "is not from ourselves, nor from our nature, but it is given or bestowed according to the grace of God; and therefore he who preserves this gift of life and returns thanks to him who bestows it, *he shall receive length of days for ever and ever*. But he who rejects it and proves unthankful to his Maker for creating him, and will not know him who bestows it, *he deprives himself of the gift of duration to all eternity*. And therefore the Lord speaks thus of such unthankful persons, 'If you have not been faithful in that which is least, who will commit much to you?' intimating thereby unto us that they who are unthankful to him with respect to

this short transitory life, which is his gift, the effect of his bounty, shall be *most justly deprived of length of days in the world to come*." No language can be more explicit than the foregoing. It expresses, as definitely as language can, that man has no constitutional immortality, and that unless "born again" of "incorruptible seed,"—the "word of God which liveth and abideth for ever," he must without doubt perish everlastingly.

The theory of Tertullian, who flourished in the third century, exhibits the extent to which speculative inquiry went in connection with the doctrine of immortality. This celebrated Father put forth a new doctrine, as much physiological as theological, in which he maintained that the human soul was propagated, like the body, by ordinary but distinct generation,—the soul being begotten by the soul, as the body by the body, of the parent. He tells us that God made Adam's soul "*matricem omnium*,"—the fountain or source of all souls. His theory is known by the name Traducianism (*per traducem*.) Dodwell justly reasons that Tertullian's opinions concerning the soul "are inconsistent with its independence upon purer matter, though it might survive the grosser organical body of our visible humanity. . . . If therefore," he argues, "it be preserved from actual mortality it must be by the like interposition of an extraordinary providence, as that by which our bodies* themselves are to be immortalized after the resurrection."

In the following century the Traducianism of Tertullian was opposed by the doctrine that the soul had its creation immediately from God, and was neither propagated by traducion, nor born together with the body, as Lactantius and others supposed. This new theory is denominated Creationism. The difficulties involved in these respective systems inclined many theologians, among whom was Augustine, to ignore the controversy altogether, and declare their opinion that human science found a limit in this direction, beyond which it was impossible to pass. The two theories were consequently tolerated as legitimate speculations, and although they necessarily involved the natural mortality of the soul, were not on this account pronounced heretical. "It is plain," writes Dodwell, "that they did not *then*, in the fifth century, believe this doctrine of the *soul's natural mortality* heretical, so long as there was no question made of its being *actually immortal*." The strength and influence of both parties led to something like a mutual compromise, nevertheless the orthodox doctrine was that the soul is constitutionally immortal. Lactantius contended that immortality was not the natural property of the soul, but the reward of virtue; and in this opinion he was fortified by the testimony of the earlier Greek theologians, who affirm that the Hebrews did not believe in the constitutional immortality of man, but considered it dependent upon a virtuous character. Nemesius, a Greek philosopher of the fourth century, and a convert to Christianity, afterwards made Bishop of Emesa, in Phœnicia, also testifies to the faith of the Hebrews:—"The Hebrews confessedly say that man was created from the first neither mortal nor immortal,

* Dodwell fell into the common error of accepting the philosophical distinction between soul and body, and departs from the phraseology of Scripture, which nowhere speaks of resurrection of the *body*, but of the *dead*.

but capable of either nature; that should he incline to fleshly passions, he might incur the fate of the flesh; but if he aspired after spiritual excellence, he should be esteemed worthy of immortality."

Origen differed both from Tertullian and the Creationists, and gave it as his opinion that human souls had a pre-existence. By this theory he easily disposed of the objection that what had a beginning could not be inherently immortal. "Among the primitive Christians," says Dodwell, "this doctrine of Origen was taken for very singular, nor did the great authority of the man recommend it to many among them. They generally condemned it in Plato himself. They generally took it for a maxim in arguing, that whatever had a beginning could not be necessarily or naturally immortal. On this principle they owned none immortal but God himself,—no, not the angels."

Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical History, informs us of a sect existing in the third century, in Arabia, who denied the natural immortality of the soul. They appear to have been of sufficient importance to give occasion to "a considerable council," to take into consideration what at this period among professional theologians was pronounced a heresy. "These," writes Eusebius, "asserted that the human soul, as long as the present state of the world existed, perished at death and died with the body, but that it would be raised again with the body at the time of the resurrection." Against the opinions of these primitive Arabians, the theological powers of Origen, the great champion of the nascent orthodoxy, were enlisted, and who appears to have been successful in overturning their previous faith, and bringing them to the persuasion of the new Platonism, or philosophical Christianity, which was rapidly extending itself over the ancient Christendom.

Some of the Fathers of this period, among whom were Cyprian, Arnobius, and Athanasius, considered the soul to be naturally mortal, and ascribed its immortality to the communication of the Divine Spirit. It must, however, be acknowledged that the doctrine of the Church,—the orthodox, and which was daily becoming the popular doctrine was, that the soul is immortal. Subtile disputes in theology were, in those earlier times, as in our own, mostly confined to professional theologians, the "laity" not concerning themselves with these disputes, grew in a less discriminating and more dogmatic faith. The immortality of the soul, in some sense or other, was the orthodox, if not the universal, belief.

In concluding our sketch of the state of the doctrine of immortality at the close of the fifth century, it is scarcely necessary to remind the reader of the very speculative character of the period comprised in this section. The doctrine of the immortality of the soul took its rise in mere philosophical conjecture; was debated as a question of human science, and established upon this necessarily imperfect basis. Its introduction into the earlier Christianity is attributable to the influence of the Greek and Latin Fathers. Gieseler, in his Compendium of Ecclesiastical History, acknowledges this influence in the doctrinal theology of this period. "A speculative treatment of Christian doctrine was," he says, "generally indispensable, if Christianity should be accessible to the philosophical culture of the times, and was rendered unavoidable by the measures of the Gnostics. It could only proceed from Platon-

ism, which of all philosophical systems stood the nearest to Christianity. While many Platonic philosophers were brought over to Christianity by this internal relation, they received the latter as the most perfect philosophy, and retained, with their philosophical mantle, their philosophical turn of mind also. They set out with this principle * * * that the truth taught by Plato was derived from Moses and the prophets. The arbitrary mode of interpretation then current furnished them with the means of proving their views, even from numerous passages of the Old Testament, which they could use, indeed, only in the Septuagint version. Thus, then, they overvalued even the actual agreement of Plato with Christianity, and believed that they found many a Platonic idea in the latter, which in reality they themselves had first introduced into it."

(To be Continued.)

"THE EXPOSITOR OF LIFE AND IMMORTALITY."

This is the title of a magazine started by our fellow-laborer, W. S. MONCRIEFF, in Edinburgh, Scotland. We rejoice in its appearance, and hope it may be abundantly sustained and widely circulated. We give this month his "Introductory Statement," and two other articles, editorial—from his magazine—entitled "Jesus the Life," and "Christian Love." They are the following:—

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT.

This magazine has originated partly in a desire to awaken attention to the Scriptural views of "Life and Immortality," by a wish to meet, as far as possible, the demands of the increasing number of inquirers throughout the country for light on these great Bible truths, and others that are inseparably connected with them. The cause in which we are engaged in one of pressing and incalculable moment, and the friends of the "Life-Truth" are anxious that others may enjoy the openings up of Scripture, which have had so delightful an effect on their own minds. We begin depending on God; we express to Him our gratitude for having opened to us another door of usefulness. May he grant such a blessing as shall cheer his servants engaged in this undertaking for his glory; may he use this work for the enlightenment of his people, and in drawing sinners to the peace, and joy, and hope of salvation. He, in the greatness of his love, says to each sinful child, "Why will ye die?" We shall repeat our Father's words again and again to those who are continuing in rebellion, and shew them that blessed Redeemer who gave his flesh "for the life of the world," of which they are members.

We can make no promises as to the future; all we can say is that it is our wish, and it shall be our aim, to make the Magazine fit for its mission. The articles, as a general rule, will be short, simple, varied, and as uncontroversial as possible. Our design is to speak the Truth plainly and fearlessly; our intention also is to utter it in love. We firmly believe that the spirit of truth is calm and kind; yea, that Religion itself may be summed up in love. "Though I have the gift of prophecy and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, **JAMES** could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing," 1 Cor. 13: 2.

Having been in error ourselves on the very subjects we are to explain, we feel for those who remain where we were; we feel for them in their manifold difficulties, and even in their suspicions of those who, like ourselves, are wont to publish "strange things," and we would esteem it an honor to be employed in removing their hindrances, and in bringing to them better and more sanctifying views of God, and of gospel truth in general. When we try to speak in love, we respectfully ask from those whom we address, a patient and candid hearing. For the truth we have no fear; but, let it be acknowledged frankly, we tremble lest it may suffer in our hands. To superiority and infallibility we make no pretensions; when we pen a word that reasonably offends, and in weakness such may actually happen, let our readers remember we are men: and should they gather benefit from our writings, we would have them to bear in recollection that we have given them only what we have received. Let the God of Truth and mercy obtain all the glory.

There is already a Magazine in existence, *The Christian Examiner and Bible Advocate*, under able editorial management, extending the sublime doctrine of Life and Immortality through the Lord Jesus, and we wish it to be distinctly understood that we rise not to oppose or rival that periodical, but on the contrary, to second its efforts. There is ample field for both periodicals. Each in its place, we fondly trust, will do service over which many will give thanks. The *Examiner* is right worthy of support; our wish is that its circulation may increase with rapidity. It has done good already, even though its months are but few; a great deal more, we firmly believe, will be produced by its agency.

Along with the original articles which will appear in each number of *The Expositor*, it is designed to furnish select and useful extracts from larger works that have appeared on the Life Question; there will also be quotations taken from other religious books, which may be thought calculated to profit the readers. In this way we hope to serve not a few of our friends, for the works referred to are, in general, beyond the reach of limited means, and often designed more for what are styled professional than general readers.

It seems very unnecessary to write, that, had not friends generously come forward with supplies, *The Expositor* could not, in present circumstances, have appeared; for, a little reflection may convince any one, the business expense connected with it is far from being small.

The Editor and others on whom will devolve much labor, are all working without recompense, and hence those who sympathise with us in this undertaking, can the more boldly be asked to help on the sale of our Magazine. We cast it upon them wherever they may be; and if the past may be held to be a token of the future, our hopes of their efficient and prayerful co-operation will not be disappointed. Brethren! our end is one; each must work in his own sphere. You see what we want, what is needed, will you help? Work, fellow-heirs! the Lord is at hand; the crown of glory is our promised reward.

“Party men always hate a slightly differing friend more than a downright enemy.”—*Colridge*.

JESUS THE LIFE.

In reading the New Testament every one must notice how frequently the words “life,” “live,” “live for ever,” “eternal life,” “everlasting life,” occur. So common are they that one can hardly open a page at random without meeting them. Jesus himself said more than once, “I am the life;” and “eternal life” is invariably connected with a cordial reception of him as the Saviour, and a full submission to his will. Language which is found so often on the lips of Jesus, and in the pages of his apostolic servants, must be important, we would say unutterably momentous. Without a clear notion of its import much of the Book will remain in comparative obscurity, and a great personal loss be sustained by every reader and disciple of Christianity. Let us try to get at the meaning of these words. As a safe guide let us follow the direction of Hooker, in our interpretations on this and all occasions:—“Hold it,” he says, “for a most infallible rule, in exposition of sacred Scripture, that where a literal construction will stand, the furthest from the letter is commonly the worst. There is nothing more dangerous than this licentious and deluding art, which changes the meaning of words, as Alchymes does, or would do, the substance of metals, makes of anything what it lists, and in the end brings all truth to nothing.” What then is the literal meaning of “Life?” The Greek noun rendered life in such expressions as “I am the life,” “everlasting life,” and the like, is *zoe*, of which the primary sense is “physical life, and existence, as opposed to death and non-existence.” All admit it is so used in verses like these, “He giveth to all life (*zoen*) and breath and all things,” Acts 17: 25; and “If in this life (*zoe*) only we have hope in Christ,” &c., 1 Cor. 15: 19. Every person understands such phrases as these so well—“the man is alive yet,” “save my life,” “he lost his life there,” that no explanation can make the import of “life” when so used, any clearer. Life has its universally known signs; so has death, its opposite. Now, when the blessed Jesus is called the “Life,” and the giver of “everlasting life,” it is very common to understand these terms as signifying not life literally, but a kind of it, that is, happiness, and happiness to run on without a close. In other words, the literal idea of life is excluded, and the secondary, or figurative one, of happiness preferred. Thus a very great change is effected on the representation of the Book, for if the Saviour wishes to be understood as the life, that is, as the author of life, in its primary sense of conscious existence, and if he intended us by “eternal life” to receive the meaning of unending conscious being, we certainly lessen the force of his words greatly, when we regard him as only a bestower of eternal blessedness. Following that most excellent rule afforded us by the distinguished writer named above, we proceed to ask if “a literal construction will stand?” That is, in the case before us, must we set aside the literal for the figurative? Must we reject the simple idea of *being* as the gift of Jesus to his followers? We verily believe the literal will stand, for this reason, that unless we get life, and everlasting life from Jesus, in its primary sense, then we must ultimately enter on a condition of eternal non-existence. Had men been naturally immortal, then having in

themselves life, or being heirs of ceaseless existence, they could in no way require a Saviour to come and yield them what they had already. But in Scripture where are we pronounced immortal? The Book uses language of a thoroughly opposite character, as when it speaks of us as "mortal," and "corruptible;" as when it declares "all flesh is grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass;" and to add no more, when it exhorts us to "seek for immortality." Rom. 2: 7. Were we possessed of inherent immortality—a life that would go on unwinding and unwinding for ever, we might need to seek for immortal or eternal happiness, but not immortality itself. In consequence of assuming that men are to live for ever, as surely as God himself, no wonder that the gospel "life" has been set aside in its primary import, and happiness, ceaseless happiness, alone been held forth as the great blessing to be obtained through the interposition of the Son of God. The whole mistake, and a melancholy one it has been, has proceeded from the assumption just mentioned, and in what that originated we stop not at present to consider. For the honor of the Lord Jesus, for the consistency of his teaching, for the unspeakable delight of his people, for the enlightenment of poor sinners, let us no longer assume that men are immortal beings.—On the withdrawal of this assumption a great erection of misapprehension, and not a little superstition, perishes; the gift of God beams forth in richest glory, and the universe is bathed in a mellow light. Jesus imparts life, and endless life to his friends; happiness no doubt he gives also, but being—immortal, incorruptible being—through a resurrection from among the dead, is the grand product of his philanthropy and power. His mission among men had a view to the future especially. It was among the dying and the dead that he proclaimed "I am the life;" "he that believeth on me though he were dead," though he must die, "yet shall he live," and "live for ever." In a world of immortals he might have given the announcement, "I am the blessedness;" among men who had no life in themselves, whose breath was in their nostrils, who were hastening to the grave, he was required as the LIFE-GIVER—one who would resurrect the inmates of the sepulchre, and cause his saints to inherit an angel-like and deathless state of being. Let us then disclose him as the Life of men; and assure the Christless that eternity instead of being their home will be their grave! "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so was the Son of Man lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3: 14, 15. The bitten Israelites needed life; and all that they had they would have given to escape impending death; without money life was restored to them, their days were prolonged, by looking at the brazen serpent. So now it is life, life from the dead,—an immortal and incorruptible resurrection—that is needed by men, and lo! it is reachable, for Jesus is "The Resurrection and the Life." Ere long he will impart to his followers eternal life, and they will continue in being because his years are unending. "God so loved the world," each of us on earth, "that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." It was love divine that wrought the miracle in the desert;

mercy shown there in benign effulgence, but oh! how it radiates from Jesus, and from his cross, and from Joseph's tomb. The Israelites had their existence continued for a brief space of time, and then the dark foe of man flapped his wings over them when his talons entered their vitals; the life set before you in the gospel of heaven is one that death will never reach. Life and love radiate from the Divine Throne, they are concentrated in the Son of the Blessed, and the blaze is excessively glorious. The proof that God loves you is discoverable in this fact that there is a Jesus; the evidence that the Infinite and All-merciful Parent wishes you to be immortal in his universe, and perpetually in bliss, is that Jesus sits behind yon skiey veil, and that his voice comes to your ears burdened with sorrow and desire, "Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life."

CHRISTIAN LOVE.

The gracious feeling of charity or love delights itself in God, and in the happiness of man. It is opposed to selfishness, which leads a person to make an idol of himself, and withhold supreme reverence from his Creator; to exclude all sympathy with his fellow-beings, and often to treat them with positive injustice and cruelty. To the absence of love for God we are authorized by Revelation to trace all blasphemy, impiety, and idolatry existing on earth; and to absence of all love for man we are warranted by the same authority, to trace envy, avarice, malignity, and oppression in its thousand forms. The gospel of Jesus is the grand antagonist of this baneful selfishness: it inculcates and inspires affection for God and for man. Love is the very essence of his religion. A selfish Christian is a pure contradiction. A Christian cannot be destitute of love for God and his fellow-creature. When living christianity is thus synonymous with love, we need not wonder that "charity" is so often inculcated in the sacred volume, and so highly extolled. Looking up to God, who himself is love, the inspired writers with one voice exclaim, "O love the Lord all ye his saints." Looking abroad on the Christian world, the inspired servants of the Redeemer proclaim these exhortations,—“Above all things have fervent charity,” or love, “among yourselves.” “Seeing you have purified your souls,” or yourselves, “in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that you love one another with a pure heart fervently;” and the great command of our Master is, that we should “love our neighbors as ourselves;” be good Samaritans, as he taught us in his parable.

“The fruit of the Spirit is love.” They who are in Jesus have his spirit, and brotherly kindness and charity are among the beautiful and heavenly products of grace. Unless we live in love we are unpardoned,—we are not of God. Man-love springs up side by side with the love of God in the heart. Whoever loves God, and this affection is wrought in us by understanding his love for us as it is manifested especially in Jesus, is constrained to feel kindly toward his brother. The benevolence of the gospel, is the product of the gospel. It is a love to man for God's sake; he is its spring, its support, and his glory is its aim. A fine illustration of this truth is given by Mr. Moffat, in his

work on Africa, in the case of Africaner, whose life he records. Before his conversion, he was alike the enemy of God and man; fierce, savage, revengeful, and bloody, his name was terror, and like the lion of his native wilds, he roamed about only to plunder and destroy. But when the doctrine of the Cross melted his heart, there was a blessed transformation speedily accomplished. The lion became a lamb,—no more plundering, no more slaughter; the doctrine that moved him to love the merciful Jehovah, filled his bosom with benevolence to man. Having been born into the family of heaven, he loved the brethren with especial affection; the yearning of pure and holy philanthropy characterised his being. Oh! happy change; when will the world be filled with hearts like his?

As soon as we discover that a wrong has been done us, we naturally feel angry, and this feeling, if not crushed, will rise into revenge, and be manifested probably in some of the forms of retaliation in our power. We see this process exemplified in the inferior animals, when an injury has been inflicted by any of their number; and their Creator has actually endowed them with weapons, so to speak, by which to defend themselves, and chastise their enemies. The serpent has a sting, the bull horns, the tiger has claws, and in their case, in consequence of their constitution, the infliction of an injury and an effort at revenge, are purely instinctive and simultaneous. In savage life, and in some men who are supposed to be civilized, there is a striking and sad resemblance to the inferior creatures around them, they boil with rage, utter their wrath in horrid and often fiendish imprecations, they glory in returning the wrong in an aggravated form. Even though we may have no resemblance to these excessively wicked men, we all experience, at least for the moment, a desire, it may be feeble, yet still the desire is felt, to punish the person who willingly affords us pain. Now this feeling of resentment, and particularly if allowed to assume the form of revenge, is peculiarly abhorrent from the genius of Christianity. We are to forgive our enemies; to love them, to pray for them that despitefully use us and persecute us. We are to imitate our Master's example, who pardoned even the man who denied him with oaths; who, when on the cross, prayed for his murderers.

Love in the heart will expel all anger and malice, and terminate all evil speaking. Love cheers the home; love irradiates and tranquillizes the church. It is of divine power, and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God and God in him. Heaven is the home, the temple of love; and in proportion as we love, we know the sympathies, the joys, and even the sublime sorrows of that distant shore.

“THE PROVISIONARY COMMITTEE” acknowledge the receipt of \$5 from a sister in Kenosha, Wis. Any remittances will be acknowledged in the Examiner, but the names of donors will not be published, except specially requested. Eld. J. S. White, of Worcester, Mass., will devote a portion of his time to preaching under the patronage of the Prov. Com., after the first of May. We hope to announce the names of others before long. Will the friends heed our call in the last Examiner relating to this work? *Something must be done.* No time should be lost.

For the Examiner.

A SOUL.—ITS VALUE.

BY H. L. H.

As we are informed that he that converteth a sinner shall save a soul from death, and as the question has been propounded by the Great Preacher “What is a man profited if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?” it may be proper to occupy ourselves a little with contemplating its value.

By the term *soul*, here, we are to understand a *human being*; for a parallel passage represents the gainer of the whole world, as “loosing himself or becoming a cast away.”

This question of the Saviour, in itself, would be sufficient to awaken our attention to a consideration of the value of man—as he seems to throw him singly into the scale, and weigh him against the world—certainly he must be of immense and incalculable value.

We sometimes attach value to an article on account of its origin. And if the lovers of the beautiful, would spare no wealth to obtain a block of marble chiselled by the hand of a Praxiteles, or a picture drawn by the pencil of an Angelo, what must be the value of the living specimen of Jehovah's handiwork? What must be the price of that clay that has been moulded in beauty by the hands of Elohim, and enlivened by the breath of his lips?

Or, if we estimate the value of a substance by the associations that it recalls, if we value some battered and mutilated statue because it presents not only the glory of Grecian art, but also the image of a Grecian Hero, and the story of his noble deeds,—then how highly shall man be valued—since he furnishes us with our nearest and most perfect type of Him, in whose image he was created, and also appears to us as a rich though ruined relic of the golden age that has long since passed away?

But this is an age when men are busy enquiring after the profit, the practical value, and utility of things. And in this point of view, if we value the mechanism that in its operations transcends the wildest fancy of days gone by,—if we prize the master products of human ingenuity,—if we contemplate with astonishment and admiration the fruits of human intellect, wherewith shall we value the being that has within him not only the elements of these magnificent productions, but also the germs and seeds of *other* and *mightier* ones, that are yet unborn?

We value a seed because it may with careful culture expand and display a gorgeous flower, or spring upward and become a stately tree. We value a helpless child because he is the father of the man, and within that infantile mind are undeveloped powers that will grow with its growth, and strengthen with its strength, until earth shall tremble with fear, or smile with delight at the mention of his name. And if we thus value these things, how shall we value man, the noblest work of God, who, if planted in a nobler soil, and beneath a kindlier sky, and endowed with continuance there, might and would, in his expansion, as far transcend his present littleness as the tree in the branches of which all the fowls of the heaven do lodge, exceeds “the mustard seed,” “which is the smallest among the seeds.”

Not the least valuable property of man is his capacity for enjoyment. If his ice-like heart was warmed by no kindly glow,—if he was void of emotion, as the machinery that *he* produces—if joy never could cause his heart to beat higher, and his eye to beam with an unwonted brightness, then his value would well nigh be gone. Who would desire to preserve a race unfeeling as the stones? Who would weep to see the waters of oblivion close for ever above a generation that could never be happy?

But man is not so. O, there are even in this world, days of joy that would repay long years of toil. There are hours into which the bliss of a life-time seems to be crowded, and which make the weary son of sorrow forget his toils and repent of his murmurings, and say, "It is good for me that I have lived upon the earth." But these mountain tops with their sun-gleams are rare, and the intervening valleys with their gloom are deep and dreary. But there is another world, where the gladness of an earthly life may be comprised in the period of a single hour—where all the melody of earth shall be forgotten in one glorious burst of music from "harpers harping with their harps"—where all the grand and thrilling anthems of this world shall lose their harmony in that one song of "Salvation to our God." And man may be there! Man who takes so much delight in earthly joy, may share that which shall be perfect and unending. Man who wears out his life in the pursuit of a few evanescent pleasures, may share that fullness of joy, and possess those pleasures for evermore.

Yes: *for ever*, for man may be brought up from the dust of death—his weakness may become power—his dishonor may become glory—and that which was natural and dying in its constitution, may become spiritual and immortal by the will and power of God. And does not *this* render his value incalculable? The proudest works of man must pass away and moulder down. History shows us this. But while of the Temple of Jerusalem, with its magnificence, only a few pilgrim-kissed stones remain; while the Parthenon, the brightest gem of earth's broad zone, is but a heap of ruins; while the Palaces of the Cæsars has become a rope-walk—the Roman Forum, a cow-market—and the Tarpeian rock a cabbage garden,—while even the Pyramids themselves are all hastening to decay—while earth and all its glory rolls on to dissolution and *desolation*; while the works that are in it, however costly or enduring, must kindle the fires of the burning day, man may survive them all, and though in the cycles of eternity, star after star may disappear from view, yet shall the saint of God live onward. And is he of no value?

Let us look from another point of view. Go, mourner, go and gather to thyself all the wealth of many lands. Enter the caverns of the deep and bring up the riches of sunken argosies, ransack the bowels of the earth—enter the coffers of the rich and the covetous—traverse the broad world and return and bring its gold and silver and heap it in one vast and glittering pile. Go again and bring "each gem that glows amid earth's treasures of darkness," bring the sapphire and the emerald, the ruby and the crystal, the diamond and the onyx, bring up each pearl that lies hidden beneath the ocean wave, and pluck each brilliant that sparkles in the coronet of royalty—bring all these, and lay

them with all the broidered robes and costly apparel, with all the fragrant perfumes and precious spices of eastern lands,—by the loved one's grave, and thus see if you can buy back *a single one* from the embrace of death. Yea, go and bring every gem that sparkles in the foundations of the City of God—bring every treasure that is there displayed, and bribe the grim king of terrors to let thy loved one go. And there, while the gates of the grave are yet unclosed, and while no answer comes from the guardian of those gloomy realms, *learn the value of a soul!*

Nay, we must go further to learn it. We must pass by the treasures of earth as of no account—we must leave behind us the precious wisdom of the sages of olden time—we need not bring the prayers of the good, they will not avail, even the tear of penitence, so precious in the sight of God, is worthless here. We must forget all these and yet enquire the value of a soul. We must traverse every land, and survey every product of God's creative energy, and having sought throughout the universe, we must come back, and stooping down beside the cross of Calvary, we must grope amid the "darkness" that is "throughout all the land," until the returning light reveals to us the Saviour *dead*, and the earth crimsoned with his trickling blood. Here shall we find the value of a soul, and here standing beneath the shadow of the cross we will read—"Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot."

Here is the long-sought price—the equivalent of the soul. No wonder that the Apostle exhorted his brethren to care for the flock of God, since he had bought them with his own blood. This is the price—the blood of the Son of God for the soul—the man.

And now need I say one word to influence any to engage in the work of saving mankind? This soul once lost is lost forever. This soul must be saved "from *death*," or it must "*die*." It must live onward while eternity shall roll its ample cycles, or it must be "punished with everlasting destruction," and "be as though it had not been." These are the utterances of inspiration, the oracles of eternal truth. And that "*soul*" is *yourself*, or *your brethren*, your *sister*, your *wife*, your *husband*, or your *neighbor*.

Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him, *let him know*, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall **SAVE A SOUL FROM DEATH**, and shall hide a multitude of sins.

Plymouth, Mass., Feb., 1853.

CALLS.—Bros. Wilkinson and Brown, at Danville, N. Y., are informed that it is impossible for me to visit them at the time they speak of, and I fear not for some months to come. I am sorry also to say to Bros. Pickard and Cherry, in central Ohio, that I see no possible way to visit them at present. Never did it seem as if there *must* be men of God sent out into the work as at this moment. *Who will go?* and *who will help to sustain them?* All communications on the subject may be addressed to me. *New-York.*

GEO. STORRS.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, APRIL, 1853.

VISIT TO BOSTON.—Since our last issue, we have spent eight days in the City of Boston, and preached there ten times. The meeting was well got up by Mrs. Geo. T. Adams, P. Dickinson, and others. We had large and attentive audiences in their new and commodious Hall. Many came in from surrounding towns, and the calls were pressing to visit various places in that quarter. We think the truth of Life only through Christ our *Life-Giver*, was greatly promoted in that vicinity; and our brethren saw the good effects of giving proper notices and scattering *hand bills*; which was done in the public houses, Sabbath mornings. By this means strangers, from distant places, were induced to come out; and a number from far-off took works on the subject. One gentleman from *Kentucky* became a subscriber for the Examiner. “Spirit-Rappers” are to work in Boston as elsewhere. Nothing kills them like the truth that dead men “know not anything,” and that there is Life only through Christ by a literal resurrection from the dead.

We were kindly and happily entertained by Bro. Adams and his beloved wife, where we felt much at home. May the Lord reward them.

Bro. J. S. White preached there, we suppose, the two Sabbaths following our visit, and we have no doubt he watered the seed sown and scattered an abundance more in that field which seemed to offer more encouragement for cultivation than we ever witnessed in Boston before.

“THE FRENCH EMPIRE.”—Our opinion is unchanged on that subject. Nothing has appeared to weaken our conviction of the general correctness of it: but we have not the space, time, nor *inclination* to enter into controversy any further about the matter. Unless future *events* shall show us incorrect we are sure none can show the contrary. Here we leave the matter till further developments in history shall settle clearly where the truth is.

DISHONESTY.—When an association, or individuals publish sentiments which the author has *publicly renounced*—and give no notice of the renunciation—all men, who have knowledge of the facts must pronounce it an act of dishonesty. Such an act “The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald” has been guilty of, in publishing a discourse of ours on “*The Return of the Jews*,” delivered in 1843—ten years ago—and which we acknowledged in 1845, was incorrect, so far as it excluded the return of

the *literal seed* of Jacob: and also protested against any one thereafter publishing it as *our views*: yet these sticklers for the observance of the “Seventh Day Sabbath”—as a part of the law from Sinai—have violated “*the whole law*” in bearing “*false witness*” against us, by publishing that discourse as ours—“By GEORGE STORRS”—without one hint that it is not now, and has not been approved by us for *eight years* past. If these persons wish us to think they are *honest* in their contention for the observance of the Seventh Day Sabbath, let them *confess* the wrong they have done in this matter, and do works suitable for repentance.

RESURRECTION OF THE WICKED.—OPINION OF THE JEWS.—“The Jews believed that the wicked should have no resurrection: and that the principle that led to the resurrection of the body in the righteous, was the indwelling Spirit of God. This is positively asserted in the *Shir Hashirim Rabbi*. See *Schoetgen*.”—*Dr. Adam Clarke’s Commentary*, on John 6: 39.

“It was an opinion of the Jews themselves, that their fathers who perished in the wilderness, should never have resurrection.”—*Dr. Clarke on John* 6: 49.

CHRISTIANITY IN THE THIRD CENTURY.—“Godlike life and a holy life—these were inseparable notions in the Christian mind; both were comprehended in the single notion of *aphtharsia*—incorruption. Now the Logos was regarded as the source of this life; Christ as the appearance of the Logos in humanity—as the Mediator of this higher life.” NEANDER: *Church History*, vol. 2, p. 388. Bohn’s Ed.

FROM DR. LEES, ENGLAND.

Kent House, Meanwood near Leeds, }
Feb. 20, 1853.

MY DEAR MR. STORRS:—Though it is long since you heard from me, you are not forgotten, nor the good cause you advocate, in which I am as much interested as ever. But illness last year, and much travel and literary occupation since, have prevented me *writing* anything thereupon. Some day (when I have finished publishing my *WORKS*) I propose writing a long paper for your *Examiner*, on a subject that wants a fuller and more exhaustive treatment than it has yet received—the *doctrine of the Future Life as taught in the Targums and Rabbinical writings*.

Our friend, Pantan Ham, has commenced a new periodical (published by Whitfield, London.) called the *Christian Examiner*: Four Nos. of which are

out—devoted very much to the same object as the *Bible Examiner*.

I find the *Truth* making way amongst various sections of the Church. “Mr. Marshall Hall Higginbottom, Surgeon, of *Nottingham*,” the other day enquired of me about the doctrine, and ordered a set of the *Truth-Seeker* on account of that work containing a discussion of the subject. I advised him to get Mr. Han’s books and periodicals.

An intelligent lady amongst “the *Friends*,” also, got another set for the same reason; and a good number of the Episcopal Clergy are inclining in that direction. Dr. *Ackworth*, of the Horton Baptist College, in a debate with Mr. *Holyoake*, the leader of the English non-theists (*Secularists*, as they prefer to be called,) was sadly nonplussed on this very point—and, allowing eternal torment to be a fact in the universe, said it was surrounded with *inexplicable difficulties!* He was for postponing the solution—but his opponent acutely observed, that revelation ought to *remove* natural difficulties rather than add *greater ones of its own*. The sceptic, it is clear, CANNOT be met by the pseudo-orthodox.

With kindest regards, Yours, very truly,
FRED. RICH'D LEES.

DR. LEES will accept our thanks for the foregoing short note, and the information it contains. We hope he may favor us soon with the promised article from the *Targums* and Rabbinical writings. We want all the light we can get on this subject.

TRUTH ONWARD.—We take the following from the Methodist Quarterly Review of January last. It is found in an article on the “*Incompetence of Reason in matters of Religion*,” by Professor *H. M. Johnson*, Dickinson College.” We wonder if our opponents will not use one another up. Surely Prof. Johnson *uses up* such reasoning as that of Luther Lee, and Eld. Stearns. Here is the extract; let it be pondered well.

“Descending from Deity to man, we notice his efforts to prove his own immortality. It has been common to establish, by a series of negative conclusions, that soul or spirit is not subject to the laws of matter, and then from immateriality to conclude immortality, or imperishability. But why such an inference? Is it that we see matter constantly perishing, and, from the unlikeness of spirit in other respects, we infer dissimilitude in this also? Such deduction were even then illogical; but, on the other hand, matter does not perish obviously; and, we suppose, cannot, except by the hand of the Omnipotent. The power which created, could doubtless uncreate; and if this be true, no reason can be given why spirit is not, equally with matter, obnoxious to such a fate. It is only in its organic forms, and the principle of physical life, that matter

seems to lack permanence and durability—mere conditions of matter, and conditions in which, if approximation could be said at all, it approaches nearest the nature of spirit.

“But this argument is generally abandoned now by those at all conversant with the subject, and that on which reliance is had, casts itself into this form:—It is asserted that the soul can perish in but one of three ways, to wit: either by *dissolution*, by *privation*, or by *annihilation*. Granted; and what next? First:—That which is without parts cannot be dissolved. The soul is simple and uncompound- ed; therefore, it cannot perish by dissolution. So we believe; but not by virtue of this syllogism. To say nothing of the fallacy lurking in the ambiguous forms of the major term, the second premiss here assumes to define the nature of spirit, whereas it is only shown that we cannot define it. Water and air were believed to be simple and uncompound- ed elements. Platinum and hydrogen are still believed to be so. Some substances which are reckoned such now, are strongly suspected to be compound. Of spirit we can only affirm, in this regard, that it cannot be subjected to analysis, and, for aught we know, may be the most simple or the most complex thing created.

“But, secondly, What can be said of *privation*? By this term our metaphysicians seem to understand, the soul’s ceasing to exist, or gradually relinquishing life, “by the tendencies of its own nature.” And they argue that, if its natural tendency be to death, it will, by virtue of this property, at some period, cease to exist; if its tendency be to life, it will live forever. And that it now exists, they claim as sufficient evidence that its natural tendency is to existence. What is this, but stark atheism?—a making of certain properties necessarily inherent in the soul? If God created the soul, it was for him to give it its conditions of existence; and for aught that human reason can tell, it were as easy for him to make the condition of the soul’s existence the life of the body, as to make the presence of light the condition of colors.

“The third point—that the Almighty can annihilate the soul—may not be questioned; and whether he *will*, must so obviously be a matter of revelation, that philosophy even must consent to resign us to that source of instruction.”

THE WINE QUESTION *Considered in an entirely novel point of view, with ILLUSTRATIONS* (philosophical and critical,) on the PRINCIPAL PASSAGES OF THE BIBLE *connected with the subject*: Appendix to Works of Dr. Lees,” England.

We have received a copy of this work from the Author, but have not had time to *examine* it. From a hasty glance over it we should think it might be very instructive and useful, containing a large amount of information calculated to interest those desirous to investigate the subject. It most likely will be reprinted in this country: at least, we hope it may be.

CORRECTION.—For “*full of ruth*,” read *scant of ruth*, in Feb. Examiner, p. 19, line 30 from bottom in the version from “Jean Paul,” by Dr. Lees.

BRO. JONATHAN WILSON.—This aged brother, (now about 75,) it seems has not lost his missionary spirit; as he writes us, he is about starting on a tour to Indiana. We are glad the Lord has blessed him with strength to continue in the work. Strong in the Lord, and in the faith of Life *only* through Christ, we doubt not he will prove a blessing wherever he may go. We hope the friends in the West will receive him with open hearts and help him on his way after a Godly sort. May the Lord make him a great blessing among you.

"BIBLE VS. TRADITION."

We give the following from that part of the work which consists of an examination of the Hebrew term *Sheol*, and the Greek word *Hades*. To feel the full force of it, it is necessary to read the whole chapter on the subject: but this extract may create a desire to see the whole work.

Sheol is the only word that is translated *hell* in the O. T., and as we shall see, it always means the state of death, the grave, and corruption; and never can mean a place of conscious torment. The learned George Campbell observes, that the word *sheol* in the O. T. means no more than *kever*, the *grave*, or *sepulchre*, excepting that it has a more general sense. *Kever*, we have seen, is never translated *hell*.

To show more conspicuously the glaring absurdity of considering the Hebrew *sheol*, as a *burning hell* for the torment of the wicked, we adduce *sheol* as being the name of the first king of Israel. In later times this name has been differently pointed, thereby making a little difference in the sound of the letters, without altering in the least degree their meaning, and is written *Saul*. See the meaning of *Saul* in Cruden's Concordance, p. 716. This caps the climax. It will be recollected that the chief apostle of the Gentiles, being a Hebrew of the Hebrews, was named *Saul*. But how would it shock a Christian congregation to hear a child, at baptism, named *Hell*! Yet when Hebrew children were brought before the Lord, at circumcision, many of their names were called *Sheol*, or *Saul*! And as the Hebrews considered this an appropriate name in the days of the apostles, it is impossible to believe that they ever associated with it the idea of the comparatively modern invented and 'orthodox' HELL!!

Where the word *hell* is found in the common version, *grave* is often found in the margin, and the reverse; showing that the translators regarded *either* of these two words as a suitable representative for the word *sheol*; yet have they availed themselves of every opportunity to insert the word *hell*, where it would favor the popular tradition. We give a few instances where the margin and the text differ. Ps. 55: 15, "Let death seize upon them, and let them go down quickly into (*sheol*) *hell*." Margin, *the grave*. The meaning of both clauses is similar: Let them die. That his enemies should be horribly tormented for ever, was a more suitable desire for Moloch than for David. Ps. 86:

13, "Thou hast delivered my soul from the lowest (*sheol*) *hell*." Margin, *grave*. Assemblies of violent men had sought after the soul of David, the life and being of David; but God had delivered his soul, himself, from the 'lowest *sheol*,' from the most terrible and cruel death. Jonah 2: 2, "Out of the belly of (*sheol*) *hell* cried I, and thou hearest my voice." Margin, *grave*. *Sheol* here, a figure of death. Isa. 14: 9, "(*Sheol*) *hell* from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming." Margin, *grave*. Verse 11, "Thy pomp is brought down to the (*sheol*) *grave*." V. 15, "Yet thou shalt be brought down to (*sheol*) *hell*, to the sides of the (*bour*) *pit*." V. 18, "All the kings of the nations, even all of them, lie in glory, every one in his own house," (or separate sepulchre). V. 19, "But thou art cast out of thy (*kever*) *grave*, like an abominable branch, and as the raiment of those that are slain, thrust through with the sword, and go down to the stones of the (*bour*) *pit*, as a carcass trodden under feet. Thou shalt not be joined with them in (*kevooroh*, allied to *kever*) burial, because thou hast destroyed thy land, and slain thy people: the seed of evil doers shall never be renowned." If 'going into *sheol*' and 'going into the grave' are identical and synonymous expressions in verses 11 and 15, and are made to agree with *house* or *sepulchre*, and *kever*, and *bour* the *grave*, and *pit*, v. 18 and 19; then certainly *sheol* in v. 11 means the same, and all imply a *state of death*. And going into *sheol*, and going into a grave cut out of the sides of the *pit*, equally expresses only a state of death. Mark particularly the reading of v. 11, "Thy pomp is brought down to *sheol*, and the noise of thy viols: the worn is spread under thee, and the worms cover thee." But this *sheol* was in 'the sides of the *pit*.' In Ezek. 32: 23, *kever*, the *grave*, is likewise in the 'sides of the *pit*.' Whose (*kevooreem*, plural of *kever*;) *graves*, are set in the sides of the (*bour*) *pit*." From this we likewise prove, that *kever*, the *grave*, and *pit*, and *prison*, all imply the same thing, and that *sheol*, *hell*, if you please, implies no more, only as being a more general expression.

In nearly all the thirty-three places where *sheol* is rendered *grave* and *pit*, it would be extremely absurd to call *sheol* *hell*. Nevertheless we will call *sheol* *hell*—the very orthodox 'hell where the wicked are tormented for ever'—seeing ye will have it so, just for a little while, only that you may the better perceive the absurdity. Gen. 37: 35, Jacob said, "For I will go down into (*sheol*) *hell*, unto my son mourning." Jacob supposed that Joseph was torn to pieces, yet in *sheol*. Did Jacob believe that his son Joseph was in *hell*, and that he would soon follow? Remember we are justified in calling *sheol* *hell* here, if the translators are in thirty-one other places. Gen. 42: 28, Jacob again said, "Then shall ye bring down my grey hairs with sorrow to (*sheol*) *hell*." The same words occur in Ch. 44: 29, 31. Did the sons of Jacob think that they would bring down their father with his grey hairs to *hell* to meet there his son Joseph? 1 Kings 2: 6, 9, "Let not his hoar head go down to (*sheol*) *hell* in peace.... But his *hoar head* bring thou down to (*sheol*) *hell* with blood." David gave these directions to Solomon concerning Joab and Shimei: Did David believe that the hoar heads of these two would go in "peace" into a *hell of torments*, if not slain by violence? He says not a word where their

"immortal ghosts" were to go. Ps. 88: 3, The Psalmist said, "My soul is full of troubles; and my life draweth nigh unto (*sheol*) hell." Ps. 89: 18, "What man is he that liveth and shall not see death? Shall he deliver his soul from the hand of (*sheol*) hell?" If you insist that *sheol* means hell, then no man can save his soul from hell. Ecc. 9: 10, "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in hell, (*sheol*.) whither thou goest." If *sheol* means hell, then all go to hell; but there is no knowledge there, so the damned "know not anything;" and, of course, know no suffering; and so the hell of the Bible, is not the theological hell. Isa. 38: 10, "I shall go to the gates of (be under the power of) hell, (*sheol*). I am deprived of the residue of my years." Well might the pious Hezekiah have prayed that he might not die, if he had thought he would go to a hell of torments; but no, he thought it would terminate his years, his existence, till the resurrection. Ps. 30: 3, "O Lord, thou hast brought up my soul from hell, (*sheol*)." Hosea 13: 14, "I will ransom them from the power of hell, (*sheol*); I will redeem them from death: O death, I will be thy plagues; O hell, (*sheol*.) I will be thy destruction." But if God destroys hell, the damned must either escape or be destroyed with it. But then, How can the endless misery doctrine be established? Ps. 49: 12, "Nevertheless man being in honor abideth not: he is like the beasts that perish. 14 v, Like sheep they are laid in hell, (*sheol*); death shall feed on them; and the upright shall have dominion over them in the morning (of the resurrection,) and their beauty shall consume in hell, (*sheol*.) from their dwelling. But God will redeem my soul from the power of hell, (*sheol*): for he shall receive me." The Psalmist, and the wicked, and sheep, go together to hell (*sheol*): but God will ultimately redeem the Psalmist therefrom. But what have sheep done that they, poor things, should be tormented for ever? But suppose *sheol* should mean the state of death, of unconsciousness and corruption, then how natural and easy to comprehend the meaning of all these quotations. Ps. 6: 4, "Return, O Lord, deliver my soul: Oh save me for thy mercies' sake. For in death, there is no remembrance of thee: in hell, (*sheol*.) who shall give thee thanks?" Here death and *sheol* are made interchangeable and synonymous, and constitute a state in which there is no memory nor giving of thanks. Now, if *sheol* means hell in thirty-one other places, then *sheol* means hell here, for it cannot bear the opposite meaning of a place of conscious torment for the wicked; a place of conscious enjoyment for the righteous; and likewise an opposite meaning of a place, the grave, where the dead, corrupt in unconscious silence!! Who will believe such absurdities? As the translators, biased by their pagan traditions, believed in the immortality, and in the separate conscious existence of the soul, so they must necessarily provide a place for their reception: hence the fables that the wicked dead are now tormented in hell, and the righteous dead are now in a state of glorification in heaven, or paradise, or somewhere else. It is a pity they could not find a more accommodating word that could be more effectually twisted into accordance with their traditions, than this same word *sheol*!!

MORE FABLES.

"The Creator has given us these bodies to be our habitation—a dwelling adapted to our highest comfort and welfare. Our individual identity does not consist in the body. The body is not the man. The man is really an invisible being; and his body is the house in which he lives. The eye is no part of man; it is only the window of the house through which he looks out upon the world. The ear is no part of man; it is only the earthly medium through which sound is conveyed to the dweller within.—When the house decays, he will live elsewhere. It is now a habitation fitted up by the Creator, of which he should be a faithful steward and tenant, till called hence to give account. But if he wantonly destroy that dwelling, suddenly or gradually, by setting it on fire, to enjoy the splendor of the flames, or the grandeur of the lighted clouds of smoke, or by gradually digging away the foundation on which the vital structure is based, he stands charged with the crime of suicide before heaven, and must answer to it in the day of judgment."

Br. Storrs—The foregoing is extracted from a physiological work containing much useful information, and compiled with more than ordinary ability. I was struck with the inconsistency and falsity of this position, and exclaimed in the language of holy writ—"Great men are not always wise." How strange, surpassingly strange, that such a dogma is so universally believed, even by those of superior talent and learning; and who, upon other points, are capable of sound reasoning and discernment! Alas! "That old serpent" has wound his coils around the human mind, and fastened them so strongly, that it seems almost impossible they should ever be unloosed. The main point of his deception is to lead men to believe that they are something more than what they really are—and thus cause them to be "lifted up with pride," and fall into the same "condemnation," into which he has fallen. Herein lay the force of the temptation in Eden. "Ye are something more than human beings," said this great deceiver; "even immortal—and when ye have tasted the forbidden fruit your eyes will be opened to discern your exalted state—ah, ye shall be as gods—or the Elohim—angels." Such was his assertion; and though nearly six thousand years have elapsed, he is still in the same subtle way proclaiming it, and constantly gaining victims to the deception.

There is one point in the extract to which I wished particularly to draw attention. It is this—"That if man destroys in any way the dwelling or habitation wherein the part constituting his identity lives, he stands charged with the crime of suicide before heaven, and must accordingly give account. Now let us see if this is logical. What is the crime of suicide? It is self-murder, or the act of destroying one's self. But the author has stated, in so many words, that "The body is not the man," but that "the man is an invisible being within." Then, of course, the body is not himself, and if he merely destroys the habitation containing himself, how can it be suicide? That invisible part, constituting the man, according to the same philosophy, cannot be destroyed. It is immortal—imperishable. I unhesitatingly affirm then—that in accordance with this mode of reasoning, No man can kill himself:

THAT THE CRIME OF SUICIDE NEVER HAS BEEN, AND NEVER CAN BE COMMITTED—AND THEREFORE SHOULD BE BLOTTED OUT OF THE CATALOGUE.

Now I leave it to the intelligent mind to say whether this is not the more logical deduction from such premises. Surely, all will assent to it. But reason, common sense, and the Bible have all given way before this false philosophy; and yet the great mass see not its absurdity.

Strange, indeed, that the Bible makes the mere dwelling of man of so much importance, and regards so little the "invisible man" himself! Even the gospel hope is based wholly upon the resurrection of this "habitation"! The apostles devoted their entire energies to the preaching of "Jesus and the resurrection;" while Paul expressly declared that his great effort, as regarded himself, was to "attain unto the resurrection of the dead." Yes—he desired to have his "habitation" quickened by the Spirit of God, and live eternally. Why, O why, beloved apostle, didst thou not say something about the invisible man? Why so anxious about the mere covering, if the real man were to live, at all events. Would not that individual be counted a fool, who, possessing a gem of invaluable treasure, should lavish all his praise and delight upon the mere box containing it? Away with such utter perversion of just reasoning, sound philosophy, and the word of God, as that we have been considering. Truth is ever in harmony with the dictates of Reason; and God, the mighty author of Truth, hath never enjoyed upon our faith gross absurdities: *No, never.*

This is indeed a great subject, and much more might be said even upon this feature of it. The Lord be praised that truth is finding its way into some minds, and making progress. May these few hints aid in a measure the blessed cause.

A. C. JUDSON.

Rochester, N. Y., Jan. 25, 1853.

IA SOLEMN CAUTION.

"BEWARE OF PHILOSOPHY AND VAIN DECEIT."

1 Tim. 6: 12, 16, 19-21. "Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold of eternal life—Lord of lords: who *only* hath immortality—*avoiding* profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of *science, falsely* so called, which some professing have erred concerning the faith—of whom is Hymeneus and Philetus; who concerning *the truth* have erred, saying that the *resurrection is past* already, and overthrew the faith of some." 2 Tim. 2: 17, 18.

We learn from this that eternal life, or immortality, is something to be fought for, and to be laid hold upon as a boon, that by nature we have not; and we positively learn by the connection that the Lord *only* hath *immortality*: certainly then man hath it not. Furthermore, we are to *avoid false science*, or heathen philosophy, which taught the immortality of the soul, which is not a truth, but an error; for it saith the resurrection is past when men die, and overthrew the faith of some in that day; and it is fast doing the same in this day and age of the world.

Here allow me to make some historical extracts concerning this doctrine then and now; and com-

pare them with the Scriptures; for this is our only sure word of prophecy and guide.

"Chaldean and Indian magi have been the first who asserted the immortality of the soul."—*Pausanias*.

"It is indeed known that the *immortality* of the soul was not known to the Jews, but by the commerce which they had with the Assyrians during the time of their captivity."—*Larcher*.—*Herodotus*, page 111.

Socrates asserts that the soul is immortal—it must receive eternal happiness or misery—and that "they live without their bodies through all eternity."—*Rollin's History*.

Josephus to the Greeks.—"You believe that the soul is created and yet is made immortal by God according to the doctrine of Plato."

Dr. Mosheim, in his Church History, puts it down—"What was worst of all, several tenets of a chimerical philosophy were imprudently incorporated into the Christian system. Its first promoters argued from that known doctrine of the Platonic school, which was also adopted by Origin and his disciples, that the Divine nature was diffused thro' all human souls."

Mosheim also states, in his 2d vol., p. 290—That the quakes "to be nothing more than a certain modification of that famous Mystic Theology, which arose so early as the second century, was fostered and embellished by the luxuriant fancy of Origin." In addition to this we have Swedenborgians, Universalism, and last of all, A. J. Davis' Revelations, and the rapping and writing mediums; all against the resurrection of the dead; and they assert that the immortal soul is all that ever will be resurrected; and that was never dead! Job asks the question (14: 14.) "If a man die shall he live again?" And says, "Though worms destroy this body yet in my flesh shall I see God." 19: 26. "The Lord is risen indeed;" Luke 24: 34. "*Many bodies* of the saints which slept arose;" Mat. 27: 52. "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept;" 1 Cor. 15: 20. "How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come? Verse 35. "Who shall change our *vile* body that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body;" Phil. 3: 21; Rom. 8: 11.

All this appears too plain to need a word of comment. As sure as Christ rose with his body from the tomb so sure must our bodies be raised. Now the only question is who shall we believe, the contradictory spiritualizer or the Scriptures of the truth?

I have been reading a pamphlet called "Elements of Spiritual Philosophy;" purporting to have been "written by spirits of the sixth circle," (at Springfield, Mass.) On page 30, it is said—"In the light of this truth, it is easy to explain the cause and philosophy of those *miraculous* occurrences which took place in the days of Moses, Jesus, and the Apostles—and let the truth be profoundly realized that it has been their (spirit) power, their wisdom, and theirs alone, which have produced the *miracles* of the past and present."

Contrary to the Bible; see Mat. 12: 28—"But if I cast out devils by the *Spirit of God*," &c. Jesus did not do his miracles by the aid of departed immortal spirits, as this plainly proves. John 11: 41, Jesus called on his Father to raise Lazarus.

This was a miracle. Did departed spirits raise him? We think not. Acts 3: 6, "In the name of *Jesus Christ* of Nazareth rise up and walk;" (4: 10) "By *him* doth this man stand here before you whole." The apostles do not understand it was through departed spirits that this miracle was done. Acts 19: 11, "And God wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul." But read 13 to 16 verses, and see what work spirits made in trying to imitate the power of God.

In page 56 it is said, "There are *no spirits* which are intrinsically evil in their nature. Their source is" (made to be) "*the very breath of Deity.*"

Acts 19: 15, "And the *evil spirit* answered and said, Jesus I know, and Paul I know, but who are ye?" There is something about this that does not seem right.

Page 74, "They (angels) have brought *life and immortality* to light."

2 Tim. 1: 10, "Christ hath brought *life and immortality* to light through the gospel."

I am afraid that these "spirits of the sixth circle" are claiming too much.

Isa. 8: 19-20; "And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits—should not a people seek unto their God? for the living (God) (than) to the dead?" (that know not anything). "To the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them;" (familiar spirits; wizards, *their mediums*.) The writing mediums are in many parts of Michigan, and are working their wonders. Time only can tell what will be the final result. One thing is very strange; if it be from a good source, why do they make use of wicked, profane, ignorant men, that know nothing of the Bible? Such persons are the first to believe it: or some ignorant bigotted church member.

Chelsea, Mich.

J. B. FRISBIE.

STATE OF THE DEAD.

BR. STORRS:—As there has been so much said on this subject, I will be very brief, and only notice one text now, which has been supposed to teach the conscious state. Rev. 6: 9, 10—"The souls under the altar. These were "the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held." They were righteous. Then they never made such a prayer or cry as is represented in the 10th verse; and there must be some general misunderstanding of the text. We are commanded to love our enemies, and to pray for them that spitefully use us; to bless them that curse us, do good to them that hate us, &c. And Christ left us the glorious example as well as the precept. He died interceding with the Father to forgive his murderers, even amidst their insults. How then could these righteous dead ones, under the altar, cry for the vengeance of God to overtake their enemies, in such glaring contradiction to the teaching of the Holy Spirit? They certainly could not; and the text must not so be understood as to make void the precepts and example of our blessed Lord and Master.

How then shall we understand the text? The souls under the altar, or as is elsewhere often translated, the persons of them that were slain, &c. Now there is no figure of speech more common than

the one that makes inanimate objects speak, and often act; as the trees clapped their hands, the hills skipped like lambs; the blood of Abel cried to God for vengeance. That will do; for vengeance is mine, saith the Lord, and I will repay. But Abel himself, as a righteous man, could not cry to God for vengeance on his brother; but if conscious he should pray to God to forgive him his foul murder. But his *blood*, or to take off the figure, the circumstance of his murder, would cry to God for vengeance on his brother, the murderer. So of the individuals seen by John in vision; being slain for the testimony they bore, was a circumstance that cried with a loud voice to God for vengeance; yet there is no better evidence that they were alive after they were dead, than there is that the blood of Abel was alive and had a voice and spoke after Abel was dead; or that the blood of Christ was alive and had a voice, because it is said to speak better things than the blood of Abel; or that the grave-stones are alive and have a voice, because we say they speak the mortality of man. Now, since John wrote there have been millions slain for the testimony which they bore. No wonder that John, foreseeing it, should, by the usual figure of speech, say they cried with a loud voice; how long ere their blood would be avenged.

Z. CAMPBELL.

Englishtown Academy, N. J., Feb. 7, 1853.

FROM ELDER JACOB BLAIN.

Buffalo, N. Y., March 25, 1853.

BR. STORRS:—The Washington Street Baptist Church, of this city, having withdrawn fellowship from me, for holding and preaching the Bible instead of their creed—that is, for holding that the "wages of sin is death," and not *endless misery*—I sent their proceedings to the first Baptist Church in Maidstone, England, with the request to become a member of their body, and have received an answer, the conclusion of which is as follows:—

"We do hereby cordially agree and consent to our brother's (Elder Blain's) request, and authorize him to consider and declare himself a member of this church: and we wish him every blessing from the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Signed, H. H. DOBNEY, *Pastor.*"

Maidstone, Sept., 1852.

(Will the *Harbinger* and *Watchman* please copy?
J. BLAIN.)

As the Examiner is sent to the above-named church, permit me to say to them—I feel grateful for their kind reception, and commend them for the *bold stand* they are taking for the *truth*,—also to express my love and gratitude to their beloved pastor for the light and joy, myself, and thousands of others have received from his pen. Dear Br. Dobney, may we not hope for more light from you? and yet see you in America? Thousands of hearts which have been emancipated from the gloomy thoughts of eternal woe and sin, in our Father's universe, would greet you with joy.—new ears would be opened, and truth advanced. Lovers of tradition, ease, and popularity, will of course strive to stifle reform; and one of their devices, with us, is, the cry of "*ultraism*"—"one idea," &c; but was a reform ever effected without sacrifices, and *some*

dedicating themselves like Clarkson and Wilberforce, to the work? To the glorious reform of "life and death." I have dedicated myself for life. I have only time to add, that I know of five Baptist churches in the States which receive and approbate our views; and I can but hope they will soon be blessed with light and moral courage to take the fearless and God-honoring stand your church has done—a church in which I am happy to have a standing.

JACOB BLAIN.

FROM ELDER C. M. RICHMOND.

Gowanda, N. Y., March 18, 1853.

BRO. STORRS:—The following document I cut from the American Baptist Publication at Utica. It shows that the doctrine of *natural immortality* is deemed in danger of being swept away, in the "great West." Well, let them rally with their strong (!) arguments—truth can lose nothing by a thorough discussion. I am well persuaded that the West is a far more inviting field for presenting new and important Truth than the East.

I was glad to see in the last Examiner, a move for raising a fund for the promotion of the truths we advocate. I do earnestly hope that men of wealth, who have become free from old error, will contribute liberally to this object.

I received a letter recently from a brother Marshall W. Leland, of Laporte, Ind. He has become established in the doctrine of Life only in Christ, and rewards at the judgment. He is a Baptist minister, but has not preached much for some time past. He says, "If I ever preach again, I must witness the Truth."

Bro. Leland says, "Eld. Chandler has been voted out of the church (Baptist), but he has set up a meeting in a good hall, which, I think, will secure him a much larger congregation. Many of the brethren and sisters have embraced the above views," [i. e., the *Bible* doctrine of Life and Death.]

Your brother,

C. M. RICHMOND.

The following is the document spoken of:—

Turtleville, Feb. 18, 1853.

RESOLUTION

"Of the Dane Conference of Baptist Ministers, convened at Aztalan, Jefferson County, Wis.

"Whereas, Br. B. F. Burr, pastor of the church at Turtleville, Wis., has read an Essay before us, on the subject of "The Immortality of the Soul," which we regard as a timely production, and well adapted under the Divine blessing, to stay the tide of infidelity which is now flooding the great West, therefore,

"Resolved, That we earnestly recommend its publication; and do hereby pledge ourselves to aid the worthy author in its circulation, and thus, so far as may be, secure him against pecuniary embarrassment from a compliance with his suggestion.

E. D. BOWEN, Committee."

"We earnestly recommend" our friends in that section to follow the said "*Essay*" with a flood of Ham's works and our Review of Stearns. Now is the time to scatter light on Life *only* through Christ.—ED. EX.

FROM FREDERICK WRIGHT.

Spencerville, Canada West.

BRO. STORRS:—The more I study the *nature* of, and the *matchless advantages* belonging to man's salvation; the more firmly am I convinced, that to attain to this salvation, even through the mighty aid of a Gracious Redeemer, it is all-important, nay *absolutely* necessary, that he, *Man*, have a *proper* and *just estimate* of what he *really is*—both by birth and nature. As long as we think ourselves of an immortal nature by birth—we cannot possibly cultivate a true and earnest desire to attain salvation through Jesus Christ alone. The belief in our natural immortality, creates a carelessness about committing sin—an indifference towards the effect of God's vengeance, (if I may so express myself,) which is totally incompatible with that *Holy Fear*, and submissive Love, which form the sunlight of the Christian character. If we are indeed, *imperishable* creatures, and *cannot* die, it is palpably evident to any mind that is endowed with the slightest degree of *reflection*, or the smallest perception of *right* and *wrong*, that a God of INFINITE, unbounded, unending Love, would never punish with *eternal torture* or *misery*, any of His creatures, not to say His children, for the sins of a life-time. It is wholly irreconcilable with *any one* or *all His attributes* together, even in the faintest lights that Reason ever shed upon our benighted path.

This belief in innate immortality, I take to be the basis of all that hardness of heart, that keeps man from God, the true cause of that blindness which veils the plainest truths of the gospel in impenetrable darkness to the great mass of mankind. That those clouds of thick darkness are in a degree dispelled, and far and near dispelling, is to me an evident sign that we are rapidly approaching the grand finale of the world's history in its present state.

It must be a glorious sight to thee, and fill thy heart with songs of gratitude to God, as thou lookest over the once lonely battlefield of Truth, to see the numerous and stalwart warriors, now thronging to aid from every side, in the defence of God's *noblest, proudest, and most soul-invigorating* promise—

"That mortal man may become *immortal*, and shall be an heir with Christ by Faith in the Son of God."

Thank God! for the *Hope*. Bro. Storrs, thou and others will shortly test its truth. Go on in the name of Israel's God. The arm of Jehovah support thee in every trial, and the fullness of God's love in Christ Jesus be thy ultimate reward, is the fervent heart-felt prayer of thy unworthy pilgrim brother.

FREDERICK WRIGHT.

To hold the truth captive, is to retain God himself; is to rob those to whom he belongs as much as to us; is to intercept his progress and diffusion into the very hearts of men; is to take away bread from those who are dying of hunger. Every other denial may have its reason, may find its excuse; but there can be no reason, no excuse for withholding the truth. We are not bound to give bread to all men under all circumstances; but we owe to all men, and in all cases, the communication of the truth.—Prof. Vinet.

FROM LUCRETIA B. LAMB.

Heath, Mass.

Esteemed Brother in Christ:—I have long wished for an opportunity to write you an account of the way in which my Heavenly Father has led me to a reception of what I now understand to be his revealed truth; circumstances have hitherto prevented my doing so, although ten years have intervened since I have fully believed that Jesus is the true source of Immortality, and the wages of sin is death.

The excitement of the season of forty-three, which brought my dear brother [David W. White,] from Philadelphia, to warn us that our probation was fast hastening to a close, led me to examine my standing as a Christian, and my Bible to learn what was there revealed. I had long considered myself a Bible scholar, able to teach others; but I now discovered that I was ignorant, and resolved that with the Bible in my hands I would not be beholden to any one to tell me what was contained in it.—The question arose, with so many different explanations of the written word, How shall I know what it does teach? I came to the conclusion, after much anxiety, that the Spirit of God which indited the sacred page was the only adequate teacher to which I could refer. I would say here, that I was searching to find whether Second Advent Doctrine was a Bible truth or not, I had no idea of finding the end of the wicked death, or the sleep of the dead, contained in the same volume; those, I knew to be errors. I commenced my Bible—which was very familiar; so much so that I could repeat whole gospels—with looking to God for his Spirit that I might understand his word.—I went through with the whole Bible in the same way. I became fully established in the Second Advent Doctrine. The question often arose—while giving myself up to Divine teaching—why is the end of the wicked always called death, destruction, perish, &c? I then went over my Bible again in the same way, and became satisfied that these views were there taught, but found some difficulties—such as the parable of the rich man—the thief on the cross—the smoke of their torment, and the like. I wrote to my brother to get an explanation from you of these parts of Holy Writ. He sent me your Six Sermons, which was the first I ever read upon the subject. I had studiously avoided the pieces in the Examiner, fearing I should be led into an error. A perusal of those discourses cleared away all the difficulties in my mind; so much so that the subject appears wonderfully clear and interesting; and I can but wonder at my former blindness and ignorance. I was governed by the opinion of others, and supposed the way I had been instructed must be right, as my parents were very good people. I did not search the Bible with a prayerful spirit to know for myself what it did teach. My father became convinced that this was Bible truth. Before his death he told me he could not say aught against it. My mother and brother Joseph are firmly established in this truth, yet there are but few among us who do not consider it heresy. I have been told that it was a more pernicious doctrine than that taught by Tom Paine.

It has been my practice when thus denounced to refer my cause to God, that I might know whether

I was such an instrument of evil; but the result has ever been a firmer conviction that it was truth. I never heard a sermon from the living preacher upon this subject, but I find the Examiner a rich treat, and hail its arrival with delight.

The discourses of Rev. J. Panton Ham are exceedingly clear and interesting; and it does seem as if any candid enquirers after truth could not fail to be convinced.

I am a poor widow—the mother of eight children—and have watched and taken care of a sick and helpless husband seven years. Last March he fell asleep. I trust in Jesus. The glorious doctrine of the Resurrection has been the most consoling theme for meditation in this bereavement. How sweet to think his life is hid with Christ in God, and that when Christ who is his life shall appear, he will also appear with him in glory: not a poor worn-out sufferer, but a triumphant conquerer. O, how worthy the aspiration of every intelligent being—how noble the purpose of those who strive to attain unto the resurrection of the dead. The sermons I hear are seldom seasoned with this cordial doctrine; or if brought to view, it is in such a way as renders it of no effect. Last Sabbath I heard a sermon from these excellent words, “I go to prepare a place for you, and if I go and prepare a place for you I will come again and receive you to myself, that where I am there ye may be also.” The time of Christ’s coming was at death, said the preacher; and the believer would hardly close his eyes upon these sublunary hills, before he would fix them upon the throne of God. The resurrection he never alluded to. I could not but think this was another gospel. He said many things that were very good, but I have to pick out and throw away much that I hear at the present day, and I do fear it will one day be found to be hay, wood, and stubble. It would give me much pleasure if the Providence of God should lead you this way, that I might have an interview, and hear from your lips the truth of the gospel. I think many would come together to hear, and good would be done; at least, I trust to meet you in the Kingdom of God. For this great object let us labor and pray, and we shall be truly conquerors through him who loved us, and died for us.

SELECTED.

To the Editor of Christian Examiner, [ENG.]

MANCHESTER.

MY DEAR SIR,—Your favor, enclosing two periodicals and tract on the Lord’s Supper, with enclosures, I duly received, and tender you my best thanks. My booksellers have also forwarded me the two numbers of the “Examiner” since I gave them the name of Tweedle. Another subscriber takes the latter copies off my hands. Mr. Moncrieff’s sermon, “The Question of Questions,” is an able production, and full of evangelical unction. I have read them (the numbers) through with great interest. One of our preachers dined with me on Sunday last. The topic of his morning’s discourse was (strangely enough) the “Ordinance of the Lord’s Supper,”—he took the liberal and anti-sacerdotal views of the question. My wife (who is more zealous in this way than myself) took the opportunity to lend your tract, and elicited from him a confession of non-belief in inherent human immortality. I was quite unprepared for so much pro-

gress as this in opposition to orthodoxy. I hope the little book will do him as much good as it has done us. I never saw so clearly before the nature of the Christian Redemption; from what a loss Christ saves us; and how "great" a "salvation" is that which he effects. Formerly I regarded the scheme of Redemption as achieving for us something involving all the difference between eternal happiness and eternal misery. Now I regard it as that which achieves for us a condition involving all the difference between non-entity and everlasting existence. I think the latter salvation a greater one than the former. The former does not gain *life* for us—we are supposed to have that already; it merely superadds felicity to life. The latter brings us right out of the dark blank of oblivion and nothingness, into a state of conscious existence, and throws (so to speak) *bliss* into the bargain. To my mind this is vastly a *greater* salvation than the orthodox redemption. And, indeed, orthodoxy stands charged with robbing Christ of the largest part of his glory in the work of human redemption; and remains (unwittingly) exposed to the curse in the end of the Apocalypse against those who add too, and diminish from, the words of inspiration. This is a redeeming scheme (I mean that out of death into life), which challenges my respect and homage. The other scheme, I admit, compelled *gratitude*, but (if it be no irreverence to say it) not *respect*. To go to Christ as an escape from the torment of eternal fire, always seemed to me so vulgar and *Mahometan* an idea, that one feels he could not condescend to it.

Again I thank you for the small book. As I read it, my heart cleaved to the Savior with an unwonted intensity. No one can drink deeply into these views without loving Christ ten-fold more than before."

PRIDE OF STATION.—Persons in eminent stations are wont to disapprove of whatever is contrary to law and received usage, and to deny to others the privilege of neglecting and repudiating this usage which they assume to themselves. Thus it happened that many who were very sparing of their own worship of the gods, took offence at the early Christians for their contempt of the state-religion, and taxed them with mere obstinacy, because they steadily refused to burn incense on the altars of the gods, or to swear by the genius of the Emperor.—*Kitto's Journal*.

PLEDGES to aid in publishing "*Bible vs. Tradition*," if paid soon will greatly aid us. We have already paid out double what we have received in getting that work forward. It will cost more than we expected, and it is likely to make upwards of 300 pages. Unless all that has been pledged is received early, and our friends make exertions to help us dispose of the work, we shall be heavily loaded by the undertaking to publish it. We intended to have had it out by this time; but we have been hindered by absence and otherwise: over 200 pages of it, however, are stereotyped, and the remainder will be pushed forward as fast as possible. Though

the work will be larger than was calculated, the retail price will not exceed 75 cents, bound. Any person sending us *one dollar* will help us, and shall have a copy sent free of cost, by mail, or otherwise, as soon as it is issued.

HAM'S WORKS.—We have just issued another edition of his "*Life and Death, or the Theology of the Bible in relation to Human Immortality*." We call the attention of all to the fact that we have *reduced* the price of these valuable works so low that there is no excuse for not circulating them. The two should go together. We now retail them at *ten cents* per copy: or ten copies will be sent for one dollar, and *we* pay the postage; 24 copies for \$2, or 100 copies for \$7, will be sent at our expense. Let them be scattered.

"REVIEWER REVIEWED;" or, *A Dialogue in Reply to Eld. J. G. Stearns on Immortality*. We have just issued a new edition of this work. *Price reduced* to five cents single copy; or \$2.50 per hundred, for cash. The first edition has been circulated, and a part of the second. *Thirty* copies will be sent for \$1, free of postage if ordered to one address.

OUR DEPARTED FRIENDS.

Our friends who walked in wisdom's ways,
And now have left us mourning here,
When time shall bring the end of days,
Shall with their Lord then reappear.

We wept—we laid them in the grave,
It was God's will, we murmured not,
Tho' long we tried the loved to save,
They are sleeping now—but not forget.

The marble speaks their name, their age,
But more than that what can it tell?
But in our hearts, there is a page,
Which memory has recorded well.

They sleep—but oh! *not lost* in death,
In quiet hope they sweetly rest,
For *he* the resurrection saith,
They yet *shall live*, and be most blest.

Farewell—we meet no more on earth,
This mortal, will immortal be,
And be restored by heavenly birth,
Death's empire's not—when Christ sets free.

Now by their graves why do we weep?
Death was release—it was a gain;
Death to the good, is but a sleep,
From which they shall awake again.

GEO.